The War Paper for Women

VOTES FOR WOMEN

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE UNITED SUFFRAGISTS

VOL. IX. (Fourth Series) No. 435. JANUARY, 1918. Price 1d. Monthly (Post Free 1½d.)

CHRISTIES HOSPITAL PUBLIC LIBRARY

CONTENTS

	PAGE
The Outlook	321
Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, M.D.	322
Women and Divorce. By P. G. Hogarth	322
Correspondence. By Madge Mears, H. W. Nevinson, and others	323
The Bill and the House of Lords. By Evelyn Sharp	324
The Reform Bill in 1917	325
United Suffragists' Campaign	326
The U.S. Christmas Sale	327
Dr. Elsie Inglis	327
Comparison of Punishments	327
The "W.A.A.C.'S."	327

DEDICATION

To the brave women who to-day are fighting for freedom: to the noble women who all down the ages kept the flag flying and looked forward to this day without seeing it: to all women all over the world, of whatever race, or creed, or calling, whether they be with us or against us in this fight, we dedicate this paper.

THE OUTLOOK

A great triumph was secured, both for women and for democracy, when the House of Commons passed the Third Reading of the Representation of the People Bill, at midday on Friday, December 7, and passed it without a division. We are aware that there are some who think that nothing short of an Adult Suffrage Bill can be said to secure a triumph for democracy. We are with the malcontents in so far as their criticism applies to the shortcomings of the Bill now before the House of Lords, for these we have never denied. But we part company with them utterly when their dislike of the measure leads them to condemn it altogether. When we remember what Suffragists endured for the sake of a Bill that would have enfranchised a miserable million of women, we find wholesale condemnation of a Bill that places six millions on the Register—and the majority of these, working wives and mothers—a little hard to take seriously. For ourselves, we experience a profound relief at the prospect, and a sense of enthusiasm at having helped to bring so far on its way to completion a movement which has too long absorbed the energies and the lives of women whose abilities are needed in every direction by the country.

Final Stages in the Commons

The principal changes made by the Commons on the Report stage of the Bill were the restoration of the alternative vote (though not of "P.R."), and the restriction of the clause disfranchising conscientious objectors to those who have been court-martialled, and for a period of five years only after the war. On the recommittal of the Bill to discuss Irish redistribution, the storm we predicted at once arose; and at one moment it appeared as if the Third Reading were in danger. At this point, Mr. Bonar Law intervened, and Irish redistribution was dropped out of the Bill, to be embodied in a separate Bill and submitted for the Royal Assent at the same time as the Reform Bill. Much time could have been saved, and our Bill probably passed before Christmas, had this solution (originally suggested in the *National*) been adopted two months ago. As it is, the Conference to draw up the agreed Irish Bill does not meet till the second week in January, and its tardy deliberations may yet delay the passage of the Bill through the House of Lords.

Prospects in the Lords

The prospects of the Bill in the Lords are good enough, as far as can be gathered from the debate on the Second Reading, which was taken just before Christmas. Nothing but a dissolution can, we believe, destroy the final passage of the Bill itself; and although a General Election has been rumoured in some newspapers, we must remember that such an event, involving at best an appeal to some 35 per cent. of the old electorate, could only be forced by a really desperate political situation, of which there does not appear to be an immediate prospect. There might be a change of Ministry, but scarcely a dissolution. Clause 4 does not, however, stand or fall with the Bill; and there are signs that an effort will be made to prevent its passage by the Lords, unless with the proviso that it shall not be carried into effect without an appeal to the country, either by referendum or by a General Election. The *Daily Chronicle*, mentioning these final attempts of the Anti-Suffragists to postpone the inevitable, remarks, "They might as well try to arrest the procession of the seasons." We deal more fully with this subject in our leading article.

Women's Clothes and Women's Work

The Home Office is no doubt right in issuing a pamphlet called "Protective Clothing for Women and Girl Workers Employed in Factories and Workshops." It is like the War Office issuing orders for the use of masks when poison gas is expected along a fighting front. Many employments for women and girls are as dangerous as the front, though the danger comes more slowly and is spread over months or years. The pamphlet tells of thirty-one trades in which women are employed with more or less risk. We may instance sugar-refining, work involving dust, burning acids, or a perpetually damp atmosphere; the sorting of skins and preparation of furs. For all such trades the Home Office recommends eight different types of clothing as likely to decrease the danger, and in all cases the special clothes are to be provided by the employer. These dangers are nothing new. They are in no way connected with the war or munition works. Women have been subject to them for years. As the *Manchester Guardian* says, they have been too often accepted as part of the price that a working woman has to pay in return for her wages. "That stage," the article continues, "is rapidly passing away. It will pass still more rapidly when women have the vote. This pamphlet reminds us acutely how much better the lot of women workers might long ago have been had they had the means of pressing such questions on our rulers by the only method which our rulers really understand."

Do Women Need Less Food than Men?

The latest official scale of voluntary rations appears to have been compiled without any serious attempt to seek the special knowledge of women. Any woman—doctors apart—could have told those responsible for it that girls between thirteen and eighteen are maturing faster than boys of the same age, and therefore require, if anything, more food than the boys, certainly not a fifth less, as is suggested. The fact that expectant mothers are not even mentioned among the various classes requiring special quantities of food, is a very serious omission. It is hard enough in normal times for these women to obtain enough food, so little is it generally understood that they require more food than usual; under war conditions, they are certainly not the class that should be expected to economise more than high prices and scarcity compel in any case. Should compulsory rationing become necessary, women must see to it that the mothers of our future citizens receive special consideration in this important matter.

The Christmas Sale

Our readers will be glad to learn that £150 was realised by the United Suffragists' Sale in aid of their Women's Club in Southwark. A few more sums in connection with it have still to come in at the time of writing. The Sale, of which we give a full account on page 327, was in every way a success and an encouragement; and the thanks, both of the Club and of the U.S. are owing to all those who worked so hard to make it a success, as well as to those who came to it and contributed their money and the sympathy of their presence.

Items of Interest

The Education Bill is to be allowed to lapse, and a new Bill embodying most of its proposals will be introduced early next Session.

During the recent General Election in Canada, women exercised the Federal vote for the first time, under the War Franchise Act (1917).

The woman's movement among the Tartars has received a great impetus from the Russian Revolution. According to Mr. M. Philips Price, special correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian*, "one has only to walk down the streets in Kazan to see that here at least Moslem women are socially the equals of men, and have at last shaken off from themselves the shackles of sex tyranny."

IMPORTANT NOTICE!

The next (February) issue of VOTES FOR WOMEN will appear after the decision of the House of Lords has been reached over the Representation of the People Bill. Should the issue be a little late in consequence our readers will understand and appreciate the reason. We suggest that extra copies should be ordered beforehand of what will be, we trust, an historic number of our ten-year-old paper.

The Editor.

ELIZABETH GARRETT ANDERSON, M.D.

A great pioneer of women's freedom has passed away in Elizabeth Garrett Anderson, who died at Aldeburgh on December 17, in her eighty-second year.

As First Woman Doctor

To most people she is known as "the first English woman doctor." What few people realise is that for upwards of thirty years, in the face of bitter opposition, she struggled to open the medical profession to women in this country, as it had been already thrown open in Switzerland (where Miss Elizabeth Blackwell had graduated as M.D. of Geneva), and in France, where Elizabeth Garrett finally took the M.D. of Paris in 1870. Previously to that, from 1860 onwards, she had tried in vain to get received in any of the schools of medicine, or to get admitted to any of the medical examinations. At Middlesex Hospital the students presented a memorial against the admission of women; elsewhere she found herself similarly repulsed. All through this early time she had the support of her father; and at last, the Society of Apothecaries had the enterprise to authorize her to obtain her medical education privately from teachers of recognized medical schools, after which they finally, in 1865, gave her the qualification of L.S.A. With this she opened a dispensary near Lisson Grove, Marylebone, for the benefit of poor women and children; and for many years she was the only medical officer there. After taking her medical degree in Paris, Miss Garrett was put on the British Medical Register; and she presently converted her dispensary into a small hospital, the nucleus of what afterwards became the New Hospital for Women in the Euston Road.

In 1871, she married, but continued her work for women, practising professionally while, in co-operation with Miss Jex Blake and others, she established the London School of Medicine for Women (the extension of which was recently opened by the Queen). The only general hospital which opened its doors to her students was the Royal Free Hospital. In the meantime, there had been attempts in the Law Courts and in the House of Commons to break down the barriers against women doctors; and a Bill was actually passed in 1876, "enabling" the British examining bodies to extend their examinations to women, of which the King-and-Queen's College of Physicians in Ireland took advantage. But Mrs. Garrett Anderson remained the only woman member of the British Medical Association until the year 1892, when, at its Nottingham meeting, a resolution repealing the rule against women doctors was passed by a large majority. She was on the platform when this culmination of her long and arduous struggle was reached.

As Suffragist

In 1870, Mrs. Garrett Anderson was returned at the head of the poll in a School Board election in Marylebone; and in 1908, and again in 1909, she was elected Mayor of Aldeburgh, being thus also "the first woman Mayor in England." But it is as Suffragist that her name will be longest remembered and revered by readers of this paper. A woman who had faced what she had to face in breaking down the massed prejudice of the medical profession naturally required no arguments to make her a Suffragist. With the same courage and indomitable purpose that rendered her invulnerable in fighting the cause of women doctors, she fought the cause of women's emancipation from the earliest years of her girlhood. When the militant agitation gained ground, she was among those who sympathised with it. In every Suffrage procession, whether organized by the constitutional or the militant wing of the movement, Mrs. Garrett Anderson was to be seen in her academic robes, marching at the head of the women graduates. When, in November, 1910, the Prime Minister refused to receive a deputation from the Women's Convention in Caxton Hall, of which Mrs. Garrett Anderson was a member, together with other women of fame in science and other walks of life, the gallant old lady, undeterred by dense crowds and opposing ranks of policemen, made her way to the House of Commons, and there, refused admittance—how impossible such treatment seems to-day!—stood with her group of fellow Suffragists on the steps of the House, until after sunset. These are memories that her recent illness and consequent retirement from public life can never efface from those of us who were privileged to stand beside her in that second great fight of hers, in which she showed the same unflinching courage and disregard for conventional opinion that characterised her all through life. She was a great woman, with a great nature.

We tender our warmest sympathies to her sister, Mrs. Fawcett, and to her only daughter, Dr. Louisa Garrett Anderson (Vice-President of the United Suffragists), who, a pioneer like her mother, recently received the Order of Commander of the British Empire as "organizer of the first hospital run by women at the front."

DR. ELSIE INGLIS

Just after we went to press last month the sad news came of the death of Dr. Elsie Inglis, the well-known doctor and Suffragist. Long before the war, her work as a medical woman and social reformer, and her belief in the citizenship of women, were widely known in Scotland. After the outbreak of war she conceived the idea of the Scottish Women's Hospitals, mobile hospitals staffed entirely by women, to be used for service abroad. The Scottish Federation of Suffrage Societies, and afterwards the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies, made it possible for her idea to be carried out; and in France, Serbia and Russia the Scottish Women's Hospitals became famous, and were honoured by the Governments of these countries. It was on her return from Russia that Dr. Elsie Inglis died. Her loss is one that will be specially felt by all who are Suffragists.

The service held in her memory at St. Margaret's, Westminster, on December 7, was a notable one. The church was filled to overflowing. Representatives of all the European Allies were present, including Mr. Balfour and Lord Robert Cecil from the Foreign Office; also many of the medical staff of the Endell Street Hospital, leaders of other hospital units from Serbia, and her own colleagues from the Scottish Women's Hospitals. The Bishop of Oxford spoke in his address of her gifts of sympathy, enthusiasm and organization, and said she had done almost more than anyone to inspire the Serbians in the time of their deepest trial. For this England, too, was in her debt. He also quoted her dying statement that she believed she would have work to do in another world, but wished she could have finished some of her work here first.

WOMEN AND DIVORCE

Miss Hogarth Answers Her Critics

To the Editor of VOTES FOR WOMEN.

Dear Madam,—It came as something of a shock to me to discover from the correspondence columns of your paper that all suffragists are *not* at one in believing compulsion to be futile as a means to salvation. Five out of eight of your correspondents on the subject of Women and Divorce appear to believe that to make divorce difficult is to "safeguard national morality." Surely suffragists at least should be aware that you can no more make people good by Act of Parliament than you can make women abandon their cause by imprisonment and torture. The remedy, alike for the women's agitation and the question of national "morality," is enfranchisement—freedom and yet more freedom.

"The real question is not whether women hug their chains but whether they have a sense of morality," writes one of your correspondents. May I suggest that until the present anomalous marriage laws are altered we have very little chance of judging whether women have a "sense of morality" on this subject at all? Some people seem to feel that it is safer to assume that they have not, and that they need to be restrained from their natural tendency to "immorality" by the most stringent of divorce laws. Personally I believe that if all the existing marriage laws were swept away to-morrow the vast majority of men and women would voluntarily adopt monogamous life-long unions. If this is the most "moral" practice (as I myself am inclined to think), then I believe that women have a "sense of morality," and I am willing to put my belief to the test of sweeping away the law which presses so hardly on a few cases, and to trust to the compulsion of ideals rather than to the inadequate compulsion of laws.

"A Suffragist Woman" draws my attention to those "who hold definitely Christian views of marriage." I am well aware of their existence, and I do not imagine that they would avail themselves of facilities for divorce, however wide. No one would wish them to violate their conscience in this matter. But I cannot see why they should wish to bind others to the practices of a belief which those others do not share. Christ Himself was more tolerant. After His much misquoted pronouncement concerning the Mosaic law of divorce, the disciples said to Him: "If the case of a man be so with his wife, it is not good to marry." And He replied, "All men cannot receive this saying save they to whom it is given. . . He that is able to receive it let him receive it" (Matthew XIX.). Those of us who are advocating Divorce Law Reform take up precisely the attitude which Christ adopted on this question. We recognise the existence of those who "cannot receive this saying." The remedy for Christians is surely conversion rather than compulsion. The law, if it becomes law, making three years' separation a ground for divorce, might be made a dead letter if the sincere Christians could convert everyone in the country to their way of thinking. If they cannot do this they will not preserve "morality" by stringent divorce laws, for morality does not consist in action (which in some few cases may be affected by law) but rather in spirit.

I notice that the Hon. Press Secretary of the Catholic Women's Suffrage Society puts forward the case of the "lax" Catholic, as a reason for making divorce as difficult as possible. I had thought that the Catholic Church, above all the Christian Churches, recognised "sinning in intention," and realised that the failure of the "lax" lies in their laxity more than in the actions which that laxity induces or fails to induce. This advocacy of legal restriction on the part of Christians is a confession of failure. "We cannot make people *want* to do what we believe to be right," they are saying in effect; "the most we can do is to try to deter them by law from doing wrong, however much they may desire to." But is not true "morality" after all a matter of desires?

To me the whole question is one of faith in the efficacy of freedom. The marriage question is only one aspect of a much larger issue. "One might on similar grounds advocate a relaxation of the law against stealing because of the prevalence of theft," writes A. L. Green. The analogy is not quite complete in this case; but I do, in fact, advocate precisely that method of countering the impulse to dishonesty. It is only by trusting people that you can develop the good that is in them. Have we the courage to bank on freedom and leave "morality" to look after itself? Evil can work in an atmosphere of slavery but Good requires freedom for its development. Which do we believe is the stronger—Evil or Good?—Yours, &c.,

P. G. HOGARTH.

[*This correspondence must now cease.*—Ed, VOTES FOR WOMEN.]

CORRESPONDENCE

"NATIONAL HOUSEKEEPING"

To the Editor of VOTES FOR WOMEN.

Dear Madam,—In his most interesting article, "National Housekeeping," last month, Mr. Pethick Lawrence states very plainly what the condition of our national finances will be even if the war ends next year. He puts the total national debt at some 7,000 million pounds, and the annual expenditure essential for payment of interest, pensions, and ordinary current expenses at 770 million pounds, whereas before the war our annual expenditure was about 200 million pounds. How, he asks, are we to meet the enormous additional demands? His main suggestion is a general levy on the capital wealth of the country so as to sweep away the war debt. The levy, as he says, might take various forms, and the first form he mentions is the acceptance by the State of war debt securities in payment of this capital levy. Certainly the debt would be then to a large extent wiped out. The securities would be destroyed. The creditors of the State would never be paid. The country would, in fact, declare itself utterly bankrupt, or, at the best, unable to pay more than half-a-crown, or some such proportion, in the pound.

It is a simple and drastic method, tempting, like all such methods. But writing as a cautious financier, I doubt the advantage of bankruptcy to the future credit of the country. Is not a compromise possible? How would it do to declare all war debt War Bonds, Government Securities, &c., terminable at the creditor's death? His investment would thus become an annuity. He would not be utterly ruined or robbed owing to his confidence in the country's pledge, or owing to his own self-sacrifice in saving for the good of the country, as he supposes. Or the State could call the process a cent. per cent. death duty on national credit. Within fifty years nearly the whole of the direct war debt would thus be wiped off. The creditor would not be robbed; his children and relations might object when his will was read. But is not inherited money one of the worst evils of the capitalist system?—Yours, &c.,

HENRY W. NEVINSON.

National Liberal Club, S.W.

To the Editor of VOTES FOR WOMEN.

Dear Madam,—It used to be a common taunt against the political economists that their theories were apt to fall to pieces when they attempted to put them into practice because, whilst taking everything else into consideration, they failed to make sufficient allowance for that universal quality which some people call human nature and others call sheer cussedness. We have learnt a good deal since Mr. Gradgrind's day, and one reason why we may rejoice at the calling in of the nation's housekeepers to assist in solving the present tremendous problems of national housekeeping is that the majority of women have had a good deal of experience in dealing with human nature, and in consequence they are generally rather more ready to allow for human nature than men are.

Even the question of how to pay for the war would be a comparatively simple one if we could be quite certain that we were all going to behave in a strictly logical and scientific manner for the next ten years, and continue working and economising at the same pressure until all our debts are nicely paid off and a handsome balance left in hand. But so many incalculable elements come in, and here, if anywhere, we must allow a considerable margin for cussedness, and a considerable margin for the inevitable tremendous reaction from prolonged "war strain." For some time after peace is signed there will be an immense universal demand for leisure and rest and recuperation—a national inclination to "ca' canny." We have seen the same thing happen, under similar circumstances, recently in Russia. Straws show which way the wind blows, and already the various agencies at work in finding suitable employment for discharged soldiers and sailors report that in many cases the men in question appear to have "lost their capacity for regular work." Certainly no one can be surprised at this, and I fancy most of us would agree that any man who has done his bit in the trenches should be rightfully entitled to a perpetual holiday for the rest of his life. Unfortunately, in the world as it is and as it will be in the near future, nobody can afford a perpetual holiday, and the only way in which we can secure a little hard-earned relief for those who are bearing the heaviest burden to-day will be by doing without fine clothes and costly food and expensive establishments, and every sort of luxury unto the third and fourth generation. We may be able to rub along somehow, happily enough, as a nation of shabby, tired people living a frugal, hand-to-mouth existence, and finding our contentment in the purely negative fact that there isn't a war on; but any attempt to re-establish the old order of things, and force twenty men to get up at five o'clock in the morning, day after day, and toil for ten hours in a factory in order that one man may decorate his plump person with diamond shirt-pins, will spell trouble ahead. Unless we are prepared to adopt the principle of "No cake for anyone until all have bread," there will be not enough bread to go round. And, human nature being what it is, I fancy this principle will have to be enforced by pretty drastic sumptuary laws continued for many years after the war is over. There is no reason why it should be permissible for anyone, as soon as peace is signed, to employ able-bodied men-servants, or to use an unlimited supply of petrol for pleasure purposes, or to eat a twelve-course dinner at a West End hotel. Peace economy will be as sternly necessary and patriotic a duty as war economy, and a direct levy upon capital would therefore act beneficially in two ways—by sweeping a large sum of superfluous wealth into the Exchequer, and by reducing the ability of the wealthy classes to waste money over needless luxury.—Yours, &c.,

MADGE MEARS.

PRISON OR FRIENDSHIP?

To the Editor of VOTES FOR WOMEN.

Dear Madam,—The State Children's Association is deeply concerned at the number of boys between 15 and 18 who are being sent to prison for periods varying from seven days to six months. The overcrowded state of reformatories and Borstal Institutions—due to the tide of lawlessness which has risen amongst the young as a result of war conditions—is perhaps responsible in some measure for this state of things. Whatever its cause, it is deplorable that young persons should become familiarised with prison life and conditions, and thus be thrust further into crime. For our prison system—as we know to our cost—is never reformative. Moreover, imprisonment is unnecessary, for the Justices have another method which they can employ for young delinquents whose desire for adventure and whose inexperience of life have landed them in the juvenile or in the ordinary police court.

In some London and provincial courts the system of probation is used with such admirable effect that numbers of young persons, after a probationary term, make no further appearance before the Justices. In others this method is employed but little, and in a fashion which prohibits success. In August last the Home Office issued a valuable letter to Justices, calling their attention to the need for an increased use of probation, and pointing out the advisability of securing voluntary helpers, to prevent Probation Officers being overburdened with cases, as some of them undoubtedly are. The letter emphasised the necessity of securing as probation workers "persons of intelligence, active, and in real sympathy with those coming under their supervision," and stated that some of the existing officers are too old, or are wanting in a knowledge of modern reformative methods. It is undoubtedly true that the best help obtainable is not too good to be of service to eager and imaginative youth.

The purpose of this letter, therefore, is to appeal to such of your readers—men or women—as have sympathy with and understanding of the young, to offer their services to their local Bench of Magistrates as voluntary Probation Officers for one, two, or more children, as their time and powers permit. There can be no more important work than that of befriending those boys and girls who are rapidly graduating for citizenship. It is confidently affirmed that the seeds of criminality are sown before the age of 16. We venture to affirm with equal confidence that under the influence of a steadying friendship the greater number of the juvenile offenders of to-day would become trustworthy citizens of to-morrow.—We are, yours truly,

(Signed)

LYTTON, Chairman.
HENRY BENTINCK, GEORGE TOULMIN, Vice-Chairmen.
ALBERT SPICER, Chairman of Parliamentary Committee.
LOUISE OLIVER, FRANCA BUXTON, Hon. Treasurers.
HENRIETTA O. BARNETT, Hon. Secretary.

State Children's Association, 53, Victoria Street, S.W. 1. December 1, 1917.

THE NURSING PROFESSION

To the Editor of VOTES FOR WOMEN.

Dear Madam,—Suffragists, knowing so well by bitter experience the meaning of opposition, will understand the feelings of the members of the College of Nursing when reading Miss Beatrice Kent's letter. This letter is full of mis-statements in relation to the College, which is promoted entirely for the well-being of the nursing profession. Miss Kent is anxious that "all fair-minded people should know" that the seven signatories to the Articles of Association of the College were not nurses, and that the first Council is a nominated one. Miss Kent is probably unaware that the position of the seven signatories to the Articles of Association is purely a technical one, and of no importance whatever. Miss Kent, however, omits to point out that the first nominated Council consists of twenty-one trained nurses, ten members of the medical profession (one of whom is a woman), and only three "laymen," including the Chairman, the Hon. Sir Arthur Stanley. Miss Kent objects to the autocratic nature of the College. In April next the nurses on the Register of the College, now numbering over 7,000 fully-trained, certificated working nurses, begin to elect their own Council by postal ballot, each member having a vote for each vacancy. Miss Kent's plea for a professional and democratic body is thus answered.

In her letter Miss Kent states "that for many years there have existed many societies of trained nurses, well-organised and self-governed, the members spending their money freely for the reform of the nursing profession; and a professional College was part of their programme." Is it surprising, seeing what little these societies have effected, that 7,000 members of the nursing profession have joined the College of Nursing in the hope of reaching ends so long-desired, and as yet unattained? State Registration is one of the great aims of the College, which has done all in its power to meet the other societies in an agreed Bill. With unity, State Registration might soon be achieved. Surely the "older" societies, seeing how ineffective their methods have been in the past, even if they cannot bring themselves to assist the College, might at least refrain from ungenerous and narrow-minded opposition. It is a grievance of those opposed to the College that it is being made a channel for a charitable appeal to the public, on the grounds that such an appeal leads to the pauperisation of the nursing profession. We have heard much of the endowment of research; the medical profession is now appealing for funds, particularly for the endowment of a medical school for women; there is an almost daily appeal on behalf of officers and men of the two services, yet none of these feel that they are being pauperised. Then why should an appeal to the public on behalf of the nursing profession be looked upon in a different light?

I quite agree with Miss Kent that "adequate provision for nurses disabled and incapacitated through war service should be the duty of the State," but the appeal to the public is for the endowment of the profession as a whole. Pensions and assistance granted by the State will not touch the over-worked and under-paid civil nurse who has valiantly "done her bit" to release other nurses for active service, nor will State pensions to nurses incapacitated by war service assist in the foundation of a professional college, or help on the education of the coming generations of nurses.—Yurs, &c.,

M. CARTER.

New Victorian Club, Sackville Street, W. 1.

HENRY VIII. AND DIVORCE

To the Editor of VOTES FOR WOMEN.

Dear Madam,—I think the Catholic lady, Miss Willis (who writes you on the dispute as to nullity of marriage between Henry VIII. and the Pope) must have been educated by the Jesuits for her so to misrepresent the case. The following is the real history. The eldest son of Henry VII. was the first husband of Catherine of Aragon, but died as Prince of Wales. His father, being extremely avaricious, and in order to put in his family the rich portion of Aragon, decided to sacrifice his youngest son, Henry—then a boy of 19—by marrying him to his brother's widow, aged 40. Now a marriage with the widow of a brother is contrary to the canons of the Romish Church unless with a special dispensation from the reigning Pope, but as these holy persons demand a very large fee for the said dispensation, the miserly Henry VII. decided to dispense with the same; consequently, the marriage of his son Henry had *always* been null and void in Catholic ecclesiastical law. When at last Henry VIII. demanded that this fact should be recognised, no doubt the Pope of the day would willingly have consented (especially for a large fee), but, unfortunately for Henry VIII., Catherine of Aragon was sister of the Emperor Charles V., and the then Pope dared not go contrary to him. So Henry wisely decided not to remain any longer the victim of his avaricious father, or of Popes too cowardly to do their duty. And should we not all be grateful to him for having thus for ever delivered us from their foreign yoke?—Yours, &c.,

A. M. F. SALES,
President Pau Branch of Union Française pour le Suffrage des Femmes.

Articles and News contributed for insertion in VOTES FOR WOMEN should be sent to The Editors, VOTES FOR WOMEN, 27 Chancery Lane, W.C. 2.

Subscriptions to the paper should be sent to The Publisher, VOTES FOR WOMEN, 27, Chancery Lane, W.C.2.

The terms are (while a monthly issue), post free, 2s. annual subscription, 1s. for six months, inside the United Kingdom; 2s. (½dol.) and 1s. (25 cents) abroad, payable in advance.

VOTES FOR WOMEN

27, CHANCERY LANE, W.C.

Telegraphic Address:—Unisuffra, Holb., London
Telephone:—Holborn 5880

JANUARY, 1918.

THE BILL AND THE HOUSE OF LORDS

The Representation of the People Bill left the House of Commons on Friday, December 7, and the First Reading was moved by Viscount Peel in the House of Lords on Tuesday, December 11, and was passed without a division. On Monday, December 17, the Second Reading debate was opened by Lord Salisbury, and continued for three days. The Bill was read a second time on December 19; and the Committee stage will be entered upon on January 8, after the reassembling of the House of Lords.

The tone of the Second Reading debate was interesting, if in some respects a little dubious from the point of view of this paper. As far as anything definite could be gathered from it, it seems fairly certain that the Bill as a whole is safe, and that the Lords, including some extremists who do not conceal their dislike for the measure, are determined to pass it rather than embarrass the Government at a time like the present. Lord Halsbury's decision to support it, as reported in the *Times* (December 19), was characteristic of this attitude.

> Certainly nothing would be more injurious to the country than to suggest that the present advisers of His Majesty should be displaced by some deliberate determination of one party in the State to turn them out. That consideration placed upon them a very serious responsibility. It was with great reluctance that he would feel himself compelled to vote for the second reading of the Bill, but he would do so in the belief that nothing should be done knowingly by any political party which would prevent the due prosecution of the war. (Cheers.)

Lord Chaplin took a similar line, saying that after much reflection he had decided that it would not be right to do anything to imperil the passing of the Bill. The conciliatory speeches of Lord Crewe and Lord Curzon, showing how the Bill is really a war measure, which has arisen out of the special circumstances created by the war, helped to sustain this attitude of toleration for the widest measure of Reform that has ever been submitted to the House of Lords; while other speakers, like Lord Burnham and Lord Buckmaster, spoke in active support, but with that temperateness of tone that is more characteristic of the Upper than the Lower House. There is no doubt that, as far as its passage through the Lords is concerned, the Bill is safe. But will Clause 4 survive that passage?

Clause IV.

During the Second Reading debate many allusions were made to the most striking innovation in the Bill, some of which were favourable, others antagonistic. Against the inclusion of Woman Suffrage, Lord Bryce urged that no evidence was forthcoming that the nation desired this change: "it was very doubtful whether, if the question were left to a vote of all the women in the country, it could be carried." On the other hand, with some inconsistency, he maintained that the extension of the vote to 6,000,000 women meant that "the agitation would continue until all women were enfranchised." We confess that we find it difficult to understand—even allowing for the Anti-suffragist's traditional view of woman's inconstancy—why women, who do not wish for the vote, should either initiate or desire to continue an agitation for more votes.

Lord Sydenham, in a speech which was directed as much against democracy in general as against the enfranchisement of women, declared that womanhood suffrage would certainly follow in a very short time (we wish we felt as sure of this as some noble lords appear to be) and insisted that "no revolutionary change should be made until the will of the people had been expressed at a General Election." Lord Sydenham seems to have decided in his own mind the knotty problem as to whether the hen or the egg comes first; but we doubt if he really has a large following in this respect. Lord Salisbury's attitude—that of a former opponent to our cause—strikes us as a much more statesmanlike one. According to the *Times* (December 15):—

> He had great confidence in his countrymen, and it was in the interests of the State that they should trust the working classes. As to the women's vote, which added six millions to the electorate, there was no reason why they should not trust the women. Still, he could not but view with alarm the enormous increase in the electorate which the proposals involved.

The Lord Chancellor was non-committal, merely saying that he trusted the House would pass the Second Reading, though "it must not be supposed that such support meant approval of the clause conferring the franchise upon women." Against all this we must, however, set the favourable speeches that were made.

The Suffragist Peers

Lord Burnham, in a very fine speech in defence of the Bill, contended with sound sense that "the Speaker's Conference had to attempt a national settlement, and they could not leave women out. *To have done so would have created trouble, not allayed it.*" Earl Russell held that as "the franchise was a weapon which men needed for their defence and the protection of their interests and labour, women needed that just as much." Lord Crewe thought that "opinion had been modified by the recent more extended participation of women in the industrial activities of the country." He also made the valuable point that "the country as a whole might be taken as having given a verdict of approbation," an argument also used by Lord Buckmaster, who instanced the large number of public bodies which had supported the reform, urged that it could not be said the country had not expressed an opinion on it, and added with great wisdom that

> It was impossible to resist the demands of women except at the cost of dissatisfaction and resentment among a very large and valuable section of the community which any wise Legislature would try to avoid.

Lord Lytton, as might be expected, strongly supported the women's claim in his advocacy of the Bill, giving as an additional argument the difficulty of refusing to women a share in the responsibility of Government in peace time, in view of the part they had played in our national life in war time. More interesting than the support of known adherents is, however, the attitude of known opponents; and Lord Chaplin's suggestion of a "compromise," by which Woman Suffrage "should not take effect until the opinion of the electorate had been expressed either by a referendum or at a General Election," was modified by an immediate addendum to this suggestion, that "*he shrank from saying anything that would create an angry feeling among people: there was sufficient unrest now.*" This we regard as one of the wisest remarks that was made in the course of the three days' debate, coming as it did from one who also admitted that his views on the subject of Woman Suffrage "had been more or less modified." For we have no hesitation in saying that if the House of Lords so far departed from its high traditions as to reject Clause IV., or to render it abortive by adopting any such compromise as that suggested by Viscount Chaplin, "angry feeling" would only mildly express the agitation that would follow.

The Government's Attitude

The line the Government means to take with regard to Clause IV. is, of course, of paramount importance. In this respect, Lord Curzon's speech winding up the debate was rather ambiguous. He emphasied the fact that on Woman Suffrage and Proportional Representation "members were left to vote as they pleased, and he did not think it would be becoming of him to give advice or express an opinion." Since he was also careful to maintain that the Bill was not a Government Bill "in the ordinary sense of the term," but rather "a Parliament Bill and a people's Bill," we do not see that this differentiation in the case of these two Clauses of the Bill amounts to very much. But what does matter is whether Lord Curzon is going to exert his influence actively against Clause IV., in the later stages of the Bill. He could not do it avowedly as a member of the Government, because the Government expressly disclaims responsibility for the Clause; but can he, a member of the inner Cabinet, representing the Government in the House of Lords, very well take part in a debate on any section of the Bill without carrying the weight due to a member of the Government? We do not think he can, and we do not think Lord Curzon thinks so either, judging by his disinclination (expressed in the remarks of his that we have quoted above) to urge his own point of view upon his fellow Peers; and that will be all to the good, when the crucial point is reached in the Committee stage of the Bill.

What Are Our Chances?

It would be idle to pretend that Clause IV. is as safe as the rest of the Bill. Naturally, all the dark and sinister forces of reaction will be found ranged against the enfranchisement of women on the eve of victory. We regard the marshalling of the Opposition Peers by Lord Weardale, the attempt to force a referendum or to postpone the woman's vote till after a General Election, as inevitable incidents in the last chapter of the history of Woman Suffrage in this country. Mrs. Humphry Ward's letter to the *Morning Post* (December 18) we regret, as we have always regretted the opposition of so eminent a public woman to our cause; but it does not dismay us. No cause is worth winning that merely goes by default. We should expect the *Morning Post* to oppose us up to the last moment—even to publish a leading article (December 29) in order to prove that "It is for him [man] to rule because it is for him to die"—though we had never realised, until it was thus pointed out to us, that one reason for the preponderance of women, so much emphasised by the Anti-Suffragists, is apparently the fact that they never die. But one point made by our contemporary is worth noticing. "We cannot assume," says the *Morning Post*, "that

> in a year or so the tiger will become a lamb and the Prussian give votes to his womenfolk. Then is it not a betrayal of our manhood to hand over, while our men are fighting, this right that they have held of governing—or helping in some slight measure to govern—to their weaker partner?

Our Knock-Out-Blow

It is precisely because the Prussian Reform Bill ignores women that all who wish to defeat Germany should support their inclusion in our own British Reform Bill. What is this Prussianism that the war is being fought to crush? Is it not that very spirit which makes it inconceivable (as the *Morning Post* admits) that Prussia should enfranchise her women? If we thought that the leading article to which we refer represented the opinion of the majority of our people, we should indeed despair, not of Clause IV., which would be a small matter in comparison, but of the whole people and of the future of this country. But we do not think so. We think that most people want to crush Prussianism, wherever it rears its head. And to that end we hope and believe that the House of Lords, after the three weeks' reflection on the Bill to which Lord Curzon wisely commended them, will deal a real "knock-out blow" to the enemy—the enemy that is afraid to trust its women—by passing Clause IV. with a large majority and adding it to the Bill as it stands.

Evelyn Sharp.

THE REFORM BILL IN 1917

The story of 1917 is, with regard to Woman Suffrage, the story of the Reform Bill, which was passed in the House of Commons on Friday, December 7, and is being considered by the House of Lords as these pages go to press. When the year 1916 came to a close, a Ministerial crisis had just deprived Mr. Asquith of the Premiership he had held since 1906 and placed Mr. Lloyd George at the head of the second Coalition Cabinet. The Special Register Bill—the attempt of the late Coalition to deal with the revision of the voters' lists without touching franchise reform — had been dropped; and Lord Salisbury's Registration Bill, although passed by the House of Lords on December 7, 1916, had not been introduced into the House of Commons. The Speaker's Conference on Electoral Reform was still sitting; and hints were abroad of its possible dissolution under the new Ministry—hints which Mr. Lloyd George had not dissipated in his first speech as Prime Minister, with its total absence of any reference to the franchise, or to women except as industrial assets.

Report of the Speaker's Conference

It shortly became known, however, that the new Prime Minister had requested the Speaker to proceed as rapidly as possible with the deliberations over which he was presiding; and his Committee of Members of Parliament continued to sit all through the Christmas holidays. Opposing influences shortly succeeded, as they have continued to succeed throughout the year, in delaying though not in destroying progress; and after many false rumours had been circulated concerning the provisions of the Report, this important document was at last issued as a White Paper, on the eve of the re-assembling of Parliament, on February 7, to complete the unfinished Session of 1916. The most remarkable general changes recommended were the substitution of a six months' residential qualification for the old franchise qualification, the abolition of plural voting, the establishment of the alternative vote and of an experimental measure of Proportional Representation, and the holding of elections on one day. For women the proposal—which was not among those submitted unanimously by the Conference—was to give the Parliamentary vote to all women, aged 30 and upwards, who were also municipal voters or wives of men municipal voters. This, it was estimated by Mr. Dickinson, M.P., and others, would enfranchise some 6,000,000 women, the majority of whom would be working-class wives and mothers.

Suffragists and the Report

Suffragists were naturally not unanimous in welcoming the limited terms of their proposed enfranchisement, though in effect these would give the vote to some 5,000,000 more women than under the old Woman Suffrage Bills for which so much sacrifice had been made. They had to decide whether to accept the compromise as the best offer they could expect in war time, when controversy might mean the loss either of Woman Suffrage or of the whole Bill, or whether to take all these risks, to stand firmly by their principle of equality for men and women, and insist on all or nothing. The mass of Woman Suffragists, rightly or wrongly, chose at once the former course; the Adult Suffragists, including the United Suffragists, hampered by the evident lack of suffrage support that would be theirs if they held out for their full demand, decided finally to accept what was offered, both for men and women, as a step along the road to their final goal. A certain section of the Adult Suffrage movement remained outside this general agreement; but it was on the whole endorsed (with a reservation urging the Government to frame the franchise proposals on a single adult basis both for men and women), at the great Adult Suffrage meeting held in the Kingsway Hall, London, on February 10, the week after the Report appeared. This meeting was, in some respects, the most notable Suffrage meeting that has been held since war broke out. It was organised by the National Council for Adult Suffrage, largely aided by the United Suffragists, who, with many important Suffrage and Labour bodies, supported the meeting; Councillor Margaret Ashton was in the Chair, the principal speakers were Sir John Simon, M.P., Miss Mary Macarthur, Mrs. Barton, Mr. W. C. Anderson, M.P., Mr. Percy Alden, M.P.; and important letters were read by Mr. H. W. Nevinson from the Bishop of Lincoln and Mr. Garvin (Editor of the *Observer*), approving the aims of the meeting, while supporting in principle the full adult demand.

The Bill

The next step was not gained until March 28, after the new Session had commenced, when Mr. Asquith moved a resolution in the House of Commons, proposing that "legislation should promptly be introduced on the lines of the resolutions reported from the Speaker's Conference." The debate on this motion, which was passed by an overwhelming majority, was mainly a debate on Woman Suffrage; most of the excellent speeches that were made in the course of the debate were made by recent converts, or those who had never before expressed their advocacy of our cause, and some of these—Mr. Walter Long and Mr. Bonar Law, for instance—were Front Benchers. The Labour Party, at a special Conference called in London on March 20, urged also upon the Government an "immediate legislation on the general lines of the Report, provided that the enfranchisement of women . . . is agreed to." Nevertheless, so strong were still the reactionary forces antagonistic to the Reform that, but for the impelling effect of the Russian Revolution, which brought new hope for all lovers of freedom and even shamed our anti-democrats into an appearance of sympathy with democracy, the timid hand of our Government might never have been forced in the matter. As it was, the delay went on until May 15, when at long last the Representation of the People Act, embodying all the provisions of the Speaker's Conference Report, was introduced by Mr. Walter Long under the ten minutes' rule, and its First Reading passed without a division.

Progress of the Bill

The magnificent Second Reading majority of 289, obtained after a two-days' debate on May 22 and 23, gave the Government all the mandate needed for pushing on with the Bill. It seems almost incredible that, on one pretext or another, but in reality only because of the intense dislike of its proposals felt by that section of politicians, both in and out of Parliament, who also wished to be able at will to force an election on the old Register, the Bill should have been kept hanging about until December in the Commons, and should still be under discussion in the Lords at the close of 1917. Suffragists, at least, cannot be blamed for obstruction. Heartily as most of them would have wished to press for the widening of the women's clauses, they held their hand for fear of wrecking the whole Bill; and on June 19—the Committee stage having been entered upon early in June—the House of Commons decided by a majority of seven to one to include Woman Suffrage in the measure; and on June 20, by a majority of twelve to one—the minority having sunk to a miserable seventeen—to pass Clause IV., which enfranchises women on the terms recommended by the Speaker's Conference. Parliament adjourned on August 21, resumed its sittings on October 16, and, thanks to the strong protest against further delay sent up to the Government from the Trade Union Congress at Blackpool in September, the Committee stage was at once resumed also.

Final Stages

The addition of Irish redistribution to the Bill, at the end of the Committee stage, with all its attendant dangers of controversy and more delay, at last roused even those who had been most patient throughout the year. Many suffrage resolutions were sent to the Prime Minister and the Home Secretary, Sir George Cave, who, from the time of the Second Reading, had taken charge of the Bill; and the Report stage, remarkable for the addition to the women's *municipal* franchise of the wives (aged 30 and upwards) of municipal voters, was not unduly lingered over when it was at last taken in November. But when the Bill was recommitted with reference (amongst other matters dealt with in our December issue) to Irish redistribution, a storm of controversy arose that threatened even the existence of the Bill itself. To save it, Mr. Bonar Law was obliged to sanction the withdrawal of the contentious matter, on the understanding that a separate Bill, dealing with it, should be submitted for the Royal Assent together with the Reform Bill. The Third Reading was then passed without a division, at midday on Friday, December 7, considerable enthusiasm being shown by the Members and Ministers who were present. In the House of Lords, the First Reading passed without a division on December 11, and the Second Reading (see Outlook on page 321) on December 19, the eve of the Christmas adjournment.

SUFFRAGE VICTORIES ABROAD IN 1917

The year 1917 has been a memorable one for Suffragists all over the world. In Canada, where in 1916 women had been enfranchised in three large provinces, two more followed this good example early this year—Ontario in February, and Nova Scotia in March. Since then, by the War Franchise Act, the wives, mothers and sisters of men fighting in the Forces have been granted the Federal Suffrage, and in the general election which is taking place as these words are written, Canadian women, both in the Dominion and at the Front, are voting side by side with the men. Imperfect as this war franchise is, it must be regarded as a distinct step towards equal universal suffrage for Canadian men and women after the war. Another Canadian triumph was the election to the Albertan Legislature, last autumn, of Miss MacAdams, the first British woman M.P.

United States

In the United States, striking victories have also been gained in 1917. Presidential Suffrage (which can be voted by a State Legislature without a referendum) has been won in no less than six States, making with Illinois a total of seven States in which the women now determine, equally with men, the choice of the President of the United States, apart from the thirteen other States in which women enjoy both Presidential and full political suffrage. The six States which have granted Presidential Suffrage to women, this year, are North Dakota, Indiana, Ohio, Michigan, Nebraska, and Rhode Island. Only one State has won full equal suffrage with men in 1917; but that is the important and densely-populated Eastern State of New York, so it may be regarded as a very great victory indeed, and one that is likely to exercise a wide influence in America.

In Russia

In Russia, the Constituent Assembly has just been elected by universal suffrage, and in Russia "universal" now applies to women as to men. It is doubtful whether this was the original intention of the early Revolutionaries who defeated Tsardom last spring; but the gallant women who went in procession through the streets of Petrograd to insist that the new democracy should not exclude women but should be a true democracy, in fact as in name, had no difficulty in enforcing their demands. Women, as well as men, have suffered and died for Russia's freedom. It would be strange, indeed, if in her hour of freedom she were to deny full equality of rights to her women.

UNITED SUFFRAGISTS

27, Chancery Lane, London, W.C. 2. Telephone, Holborn 5880

Colours: Purple, White and Orange

THE CAMPAIGN

Monday, January 7; 7.30 p.m.—Open Meeting.—Corporation Chambers, Bolton. Debate on "Should facilities for Divorce be increased?" Opener: Miss Collinge. Opposer: Mr. Spencer.

Monday, January 14. — Jumble Sale. — U.S. Women's Club, 92, Borough Road, S.E. 1. Particulars to members only.

Tuesday, January 15; 8 p.m.—Open Meeting.—U.S. Women's Club, 92, Borough Road, S.E. 1. Speaker: Mr. F. W. Pethick Lawrence on "National Housekeeping."

SATURDAY, JANUARY 19; 2.30 p.m.—ANNUAL U.S. COUNCIL MEETING—SMALL ESSEX HALL, LONDON. FOR U.S. MEMBERS AND DELEGATES ONLY.

Tuesday, January 22; 8 p.m.—Open Meeting.—U.S. Women's Club. Speaker: Miss Flatman on "Suffrage in America."

Saturday, January 26; 4 p.m.—U.S. Women's Club Christmas Treat. Particulars to members only.

Tuesday, January 29; 8 p.m.—Open Meeting.—U.S. Women's Club. Speaker: Miss K. D. Courtney on "The Endowment of Motherhood."

THE U.S. COUNCIL MEETING

The 3rd Annual Council Meeting of the United Suffragists will take place as announced in the Small Essex Hall, on Saturday afternoon, January 19, beginning at 2.30. The Small Essex Hall is in Essex Street, Strand, W.C.; and the nearest Underground Railway Station is the Temple.

The National Branch Meeting was held on Thursday evening, December 13. Delegates to the Council meeting were elected, and business discussed. Mr. Laurence Housman presided, and Mrs. Ayrton Gould and Miss Brewster spoke on behalf of the Executive.

U.S. WOMEN'S CLUB

92, Borough Road, S.E.

Secretary: Miss V. Aitken. Tel.: Hop 4172

The Club Stall at the U.S. Christmas Sale was a great success, thanks to the efforts and real self-denial of the members, who both gave to, and bought from, the stall, with the result shown below.

Christmas Party.—The Club's annual Christmas Party is arranged for January 26. Every member is entitled to bring one child to the party, while those who have belonged to the club for two or more years may bring two children or even three, according to seniority of membership. This will necessarily involve a large gathering, and *all contributions towards the expenses will be gratefully received.*

Christmas Presents.—We hope to be able to arrange that each member's family shall receive a grocery ticket this Christmas, in addition to small Santa Claus presents for the children. *We shall be very glad of contributions towards this object, also.*

Jumble Sale.—The Jumble Sale has again been postponed, owing to the difficulty of finding helpers during the busy Christmas season. It is now finally arranged for January 14. Parcels of clothing, boots, shoes, &c., will be gladly welcomed.

Lectures and Concerts.—Thanks to Mrs. Gandell and Miss Helen Ward for their interesting lectures, and to Mrs. Blomfield and Mr. Threadgold for their excellent concerts. We should still be glad of more help at these weekly concerts; would any friends who can sing or play for us please send in their names to Mr. Threadgold at 4, Colville Gardens, W.11. A lecture on Folk Songs, by Miss Evelyn Sharp, with songs by Mrs. Gould and piano settings by Mrs. McCall, would have been much appreciated on the last Tuesday evening of the session but for the rival distractions of the air raid.

Gifts.—Further contributions to the Club Stall have been received from Mrs. Wilson, Miss Bedford, Mrs. Sharpe, Mrs. Lee, Mrs. Conder. From Mrs. and Miss Dalgleish, 2s. 6d. Thanks to Miss Somers for sugar and to Master "Peterkin," Pulham, for toys.

Important! The Club will close on Friday, December 21, at 6 p.m., and will re-open on Monday, December 31 at 3 o'clock.

ASHFORD U.S.

Hon. Sec.: Mr. John Marsh, 45, Royd's Road. Willsborough, Kent. Organizer: Miss Maude White, Magazine House, Winchelsea, Sussex

The Jumble Sale, held at the Co-operative Hall, went off well. We wanted to make £5, and thanks to all those who so energetically helped we succeeded. The actual sale realised £4 15s. A donation of 5s. has since been received by the organiser. Special thanks are due to Mrs. Barnes, Mrs. Jolly, and Mrs. Roberts, who marked all the things and took charge of the stalls at the Sale. Mrs. Barkes and Mrs. Gower very kindly managed the refreshment stall. Mrs. Caister and Mrs. Reece sent gifts for their stall in money and kind. The proceeds of this sale go towards the organising fund. A sum of £12 is needed to start work in the New Year. It is gratifying to know that £9 are already in hand. A meeting for women will be held on Saturday, January 19; Mrs. Cavendish Bentinck is coming down to meet some of the members. A notice of time and place of meeting will be sent to all members later. Gratefully acknowledged: "A Friend," 4s.; Mrs. Reece, 1s.; Mrs. Cory, 2s. 6d., for toys (Jumble Sale).

BOLTON U.S.

Hon. Sec. and Treas.: Miss S. W. Holden, 110, Tottington Road, Harwood, Bolton

On November 26 Mr. Brailsford, of whose presence in Bolton we took advantage, gave a short review of the suffrage movement, and spoke hopefully of the present situation. Personally, he was against the formation of a "woman's party," and advised women to join existing political organisations. It was a great pleasure to us to have the opportunity of thanking Mr. Brailsford personally for his staunch championship of our cause.

On December 3 Miss McNeil, B.Sc., spoke on "The Woman of the Future." In opening, Miss McNeil gave instances in the world's history of how at one time and place certain activities were allotted to the men and at another to the women, resulting in the domination of one sex over the other. This alternation of sex activities should now be superseded by the right of each individual to develop his or her capabilities irrespective of sex, thus breaking down sex domination and giving place to co-operation. Discussion followed, and a hearty vote of thanks to the lecturer closed the meeting. Two new members were enrolled.

On December 8 a most enjoyable "social" was held with a good attendance of members and friends. Thanks are due to the many members who helped, and especially to Miss Donnelly, who undertook the catering and put in a great deal of work behind the scenes. We would also like to express our gratitude to the friends who supplied the entertainment—to Mrs. Morris, Mr. Fish, and Miss A. Gordon for the music, and to Mrs. Almond and Mr. Bennett for their recitals.

HAMPSTEAD U.S.

Hon. Secretaries: Miss Daisy Solomon, 64, Pattison Road, N.W. 2; Miss E. Engert, 3, Pattison Road, N.W. 2.

We are glad to be able to announce the splendid result of our efforts in connection with the Provision Stall at the U.S. Sale. We have handed over £32 10s. 6d., a substantial increase on last year. We want to thank all members and friends who helped to make the stall a success, especially the anonymous donor of a fine couple of fowls, which brought 16s. to the stall. We hope to arrange a meeting towards the end of January; full particulars will be given later.

KENSINGTON U.S.

Hon. Sec., Miss Postlethwaite, 27, Warwick Chambers, Pater Street, Kensington, W. 8.

Thanks are due to all who helped to make the Toy Stall such a success, both on the day and beforehand, by giving contributions to it, while youthful purchasers were found in abundance, so that the stock was nearly sold out. Grateful thanks are due to Mrs. Ferguson, Mrs. Rook, Mrs. Brewster, and Mrs. Delisle Burns for gifts not previously acknowledged.

HENDON WOMEN'S FRANCHISE SOCIETY

(Affiliated to United Suffragists)
Hon. Sec.: Mrs. McCabe, 49, Bridge Lane, Hendon, N.W. 4.

On Wednesday, January 16, at 8 p.m., Miss Harriet C. Newcomb will deliver a lecture on "Mary Slessor of Nigeria," at 1A, Arcade House, Temple Fortune, Finchley Road (opposite the Royal Oak). Admission is free, but there will be some reserved seats at 6d. and a collection. The proceeds will be handed over to the Garden Suburb Day Nursery.

The "American Tea," held on December 8, was a most enjoyable function, and very largely attended. There was a ready sale for all gifts brought, and the funds swelled in a highly satisfactory manner. Mrs. Tull is to be congratulated on an excellent programme, and the society is fortunate to have as a member so accomplished an artiste as Mrs. Blomfield, who sang several songs very charmingly. Mrs. How Martyn made a happy little speech. The society renders thanks to the many willing helpers, and especially are warm thanks due to Mrs. Errington, who lent her house and acted as hostess.

LIVERPOOL U.S.

Hon. Sec.: Miss Isabel Buxton, 111, Queen's Road, Liverpool

We have now a very attractive collection of books in the library, and some members have already availed themselves of several of them. To facilitate the changing of books, as well as to keep in touch with members, and to obviate the difficulties in obtaining VOTES, the Hon. Sec. will always in future be at home on the first Saturday in the month from 8 to 9.30 at the above address.

It is rather an awkward hour, but in view of the press of work under which many of us are handicapped, she hopes that those who have leisure will be indulgent.

CLUB FUND FOR CHRISTMAS SALE

	£	s.	d.
Mrs. Auerbach ...	0	10	0
Miss Bell	0	10	0
Miss Bergman	0	10	0
Mrs. Bradbury ...	5	0	0
Miss Brewster ...	0	5	0
Miss Bullock	0	10	0
Miss V. Cooke ...	0	2	6
Mrs. Gunn Dick	0	2	6
The Misses Easton	0	7	6
Mrs. Evans	0	13	0
Mrs. Farmer	0	3	0
Miss. Farmer.....	0	5	0
Miss. Gray.....	0	2	0
Miss. Grenville...	0	5	0
Miss. E. Gulland	1	1	0
Miss. G. Gulland	0	5	0
Miss. Hasler	0	5	0
Henry Heap Esq.	0	2	0
Miss. Holiday ...	0	2	6
The Hon. Mrs. Howitt	1	1	0
Miss. Johnson ...	0	5	0
Miss. Kingsford...	1	10	0
Lady Muir Mackenzie	0	5	0
Mrs. Marston ...	1	0	0
Miss Maitland ...	0	5	0
Miss Mears	0	10	0
Miss Morrow.....	0	10	0
Mrs. Nicholson...	0	5	0
Reginald Pott, Esq.	2	0	0
Miss Powell	0	2	0
Miss Putnam.....	0	10	0
Miss Richardson..	0	5	0
Miss Richmond...	0	10	0
Mrs. Robertson ...	1	0	0
Mrs. Sbarboro ...	0	2	6
Mrs. Philip Snowden	0	2	6
Miss Townshend.	0	5	0
Miss Walton	0	10	0
Mrs. Ben Webster	1	1	0
Mrs. White	0	2	6
Mrs. Hartley Withers	1	1	0
	£24	15	6

THE FUND.

	£	s.	d.
Miss Aldis	0	10	0
Lady Clare Annesley	0	15	0
Mrs. Ayrton	20	0	0
The Misses Barrowman	0	10	0
Mrs. Betty Brewster	1	1	0
Mrs. Sadd Brown	10	0	0
Miss S. C. Brown	5	0	0
Lieut. and Mrs. Brown	0	10	0
Mrs. Chancellor..	0	10	0
Mrs. Cobb	1	0	0
Miss Cobb	1	0	0
Mrs. Evan Da Costa	1	1	0
Miss Empson ...	0	10	0
The Misses Gulland	0	15	0
Mrs. Hewat	1	1	0
Miss Holden	0	10	0
Miss Hood	0	10	0
Mrs. Jenson	1	10	0
Mrs. Lansbury ...	0	10	0
F. W. Pethick Lawrence, Esq.	25	0	0
Miss C. A. Little	1	1	0
Miss McNeil	1	1	0
Mrs. Alice Meynell	0	10	0
Mr. and Mrs. Francis Meynell	1	0	0
Miss Eva Moore..	0	10	0
Mrs. Morrison ...	1	0	0
Mrs. Napier	2	0	0
Lady Ramsay ...	0	10	0
Miss V. Slater ...	0	10	0
Dr. M. Stopes ...	0	10	0
Miss D. Solomon	0	10	6
Mrs. Saul Solomon	0	10	6
Mrs. Sutton	0	7	6
Dr. Alice Vickery	1	1	0
Mrs. Whatmough	0	10	6
Mrs. Baillie Weaver	4	0	0
Mrs. Willock.....	1	1	0
Mrs. Hartley Withers	0	10	0
Mr. and Mrs. S. H. Wood	2	2	0
Subscriptions			
34 ,, at 5/-	8	10	0
2 ,, at 4/-	0	8	0
1 ,, at 3/6	0	3	6
5 ,, at 3/-	0	15	0
41 ,, at 2/6	5	5	0
31 ,, at 2/-	3	1	0
1 ,, at 1/6	0	1	6
42 ,, at 1/-	2	2	0
	£111	14	0

The following have subscribed 5s. each:—

A. Balfour, Esq., Miss A. R. Brown, Mrs. Bullock, Mrs. Davies, Mrs. Du Val, Miss K. Ellison, Mrs. Farmer, Mrs. Ferrier, Mrs. Hepburn, Miss J. Hugh, Miss Ihle, J. W. Jeudine, Esq., Miss Johns, Miss Kean, Mrs. Large, Lady Meyer, Miss Nettlefold, Miss Noblett, Miss Cates, Miss Phelps, Miss C. Phelps, Miss Renny, E. Richmond, Esq., A. G. Sayers, Esq., Miss Sennett, Miss Smith, Miss Solomon, Miss Thompson, Miss M. Thompson, Mrs. Vesel, Mrs. Walton, Miss Wilson, Miss Youngman.

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S FRANCHISE CLUB

9, GRAFTON STREET, PICCADILLY, W.

Subscription: 1 Guinea per annum, from date of entrance (Irish, Scottish and Foreign Members, 10s. 6d.)

WEEKLY LECTURES, HOUSE DINNERS.

Valuable Feminist Lending & Reference Library FREE TO MEMBERS.

EXCELLENT CATERING. LUNCHEONS & DINNERS A LA CARTE.

All particulars—Secretary. Tel.: 3932 MAYFAIR.

U.S. CHRISTMAS SALE

Sum of £150 Realised to Carry on the Women's Club in 1918

The Christmas Sale on December 8 was a brilliant success. The stalls were stocked only with goods that people wanted to buy, and there was no rubbish of any kind; consequently, in most cases they were nearly cleared when closing time came at 9 o'clock. The weather was fine, a good crowd of people poured in when the doors were opened, and they were all people who had come to buy. We give below a list of the takings of each stall; these, together with sums subscribed beforehand and purchases made in the U.S. offices afterwards, bring the total sum realised by the Sale to £150, for which the best thanks of the U.S. Committee and the U.S. Women's Club members are due to all those good friends who helped to bring about this success.

THE OPENING

Lady Cowdray was introduced by Mr. H. W. Nevinson, who said a few words about the Third Reading of the Reform Bill, which had been passed in the House of Commons the day before, and alluded to Lady Cowdray's own share in the Woman Suffrage movement which had led to this long-expected day. Lady Cowdray, who was presented by little Miss Ray Crawhall with a bunch of white chrysanthemums tied in the U.S. colours, then made an excellent short speech, in which, referring to the impending enfranchisement of women, she begged the mothers and grandmothers present to impress upon the younger generation the importance of the victory that had been won for them, and to educate them to grow up with a full sense of the power thus placed in their hands, instead of accepting it as a matter of course and underrating its significance.

After the opening ceremony, business began and continued briskly until the evening. Every stall was besieged with buyers; and Miss Walford and her helpers did a good trade as well with afternoon tea. At the side shows, Miss McCall was kept fully occupied with her two bran tubs, one of which contained children's toys, and the other, all kinds of household rarities from matches to sugar. Guessing competitions, in which the prizes were as valuable as a pound of tea, or a jar of loaf sugar (the number of lumps to be guessed correctly by the winner), were also extremely popular. Then there were lightning portrait sketches, by Miss Kate Olver and Miss Ethel Everett (both known to VOTES FOR WOMEN readers), and palmistry by Miss Moss, all of which added greatly to the interest and the distinction of the Sale. The Hall looked most attractive, with its coloured Suffrage banners, the purple, white and orange-draped stalls, and the massed colours of flowers, books and embroideries. The Club stall was an important feature of the Sale, making just double as much as last year; and the Club members were present in great force, contributing heartily to the general success. Mr. Edward Mewett, who wore his "pearlies," gave his professional services, as he has so often done before, to the cause, and sold flowers and vegetables with great success.

It is impossible to mention everyone out of the large numbers of men and women who helped to make the Sale a success, whether beforehand, or on the day, or both: they may rest assured that they have the heartfelt thanks of the Club that will now be able to continue its existence, owing to their efforts.

DETAILS OF THE PROCEEDS

	£	s.	d.
Provision Stall	32	10	6
General Stall	21	15	0½
Flower and Fruit Stall	13	12	5½
Book Stall	12	11	4½
Toy Stall	12	8	7
U.S. Club Stall	10	1	0
Refreshments	12	14	0
Dips and Games	4	0	0
Lightning Sketches	1	14	0
Palmist	1	2	0
Parcels	1	4	0
Gate Money	4	1	0
Donations in money	23	1	10
	£150	15	9½

MEMORIAL TO THE LORDS

On the eve of the Second Reading in the House of Lords, the following memorial was sent to the Lord Chancellor and the peers of the realm:—

We, the undersigned women, who with many thousands of others have welcomed the opportunity of working for our country in time of war, profoundly hope that your lordships will accept those clauses of the Representation of the People Bill which enfranchise a certain number of women. We do not presume to claim the right of citizenship by virtue of service rendered, at a time when the service of death has dwarfed all other effort. Our claim is based rather upon future needs and upon the practical urgency of representing women's interest and experience in the task of social healing and industrial reconstruction which must follow the conclusion of peace. We, therefore, venture to press this view during the present time of national stress, in the belief that the Speaker's Conference report offers a unique opportunity for ending a bitter controversy in an atmosphere of good will.

Among the signatories, which comprised a long list of representative women, were 77 Peeresses.

COMPARISON OF PUNISHMENTS

LIGHT SENTENCES

Assault on Little Girl

The *Hackney and Kingsland Gazette* (November 30) reports case of a grainer, aged sixty, charged at North London Police Court, before Mr. Symmons, with indecently assaulting a little girl at Highbury Fields. The defence was that he had a previous good character. The magistrate expressed reluctance to sentence a man of such previous good character, but said he must protect these little children in public places.

Sentence: *One month's imprisonment.*

Assaulting a Wife

The *Times* (November 27) reports case of a labourer, aged fifty-one, charged at Old Street Police Court with assaulting his wife. It was stated that during the fifteen months of their married life he had given her a black eye, had injured her mouth, and ricked her neck so badly that she was unable to sleep. He had also threatened to break her back and ribs, and to "put her in hospital bandages." The wife was granted a separation order.

Sentence: *Bound over.*

Ill-treating a Horse

The *Newcastle W. Chronicle* (December 8) reports case of a carman, charged at Newcastle Police Court with cruelly beating a horse on the head and shoulders with a heavy stick until it became exhausted. The sound of the blows could be heard some distance away. The chairman (Councillor C. T. Stableforth) said the cruelty was so shocking it could not be met by a fine.

Sentence: *One month's hard labour.*

HEAVY SENTENCES

False Pretences

The *Times* (December 15) reports case of a man, charged at Birmingham Police Court with obtaining various sums of money from small tradesmen, by representing himself head of the Food Control Department in the city.

Sentence: *Six months' imprisonment.*

Stealing a Dog

The *Times* (October 16) reports case of a man, aged seventy-two, charged at Old Street Police Court with stealing a Pekingese dog, valued at £10. He was stated to be a notorious dog thief, known under various aliases, among them being "The Chinaman" and "Don Pedro."

Sentence: *Three months' imprisonment.*

A Threatening Letter

The *Times* (December 17) reports case of a Russian charged at the Central Criminal Court with uttering a letter demanding money with menaces. The judge recommended his expulsion from the country.

Sentence: *Twelve months' hard labour.*

MISS ROYDEN AND RECONSTRUCTION

An interesting address on "Women's Work in Reconstruction" was given at Huddersfield in December by Miss Maude Royden, Assistant Pastor of the City Temple, London. She spoke of the effect upon women of their entry into industry, and said that women were becoming more sensible of their own value, and more exacting as to the kind of world that their children were to be born into. She did not think people realised the intense resentment of mothers to whom an appeal was made to bring more children into the world in order to make soldiers of them.

Advocating warmly the endowment of motherhood, Miss Royden insisted that motherhood ought to be regarded as a great State service and provision made for it. It was no use expecting women to consent to be deprived of economic independence merely because they were mothers. She would like to see the great service of motherhood paid, and paid at the same rate in all classes.

A GOOD PAMPHLET

An excellent pamphlet on the Representation of the People Bill can now be obtained, with addendum bringing it up to date, from the National Council for Adult Suffrage, 27, Chancery Lane, W.C. 2 (price 3d., post free). The Bill has been considerably altered since its introduction, and this pamphlet meets the need for a brief and clear explanation of the new Franchise, as established by the Bill when it left the House of Commons. Journalists, as well as all who are specially interested in the extension of the vote to women, should write at once for a copy, because it will give them at a glance what they would have to search through files of newspapers to find in any other way. The addendum is particularly useful as showing the most recent changes made on the Report stage with regard to soldiers and sailors, the wives of municipal voters, paupers, and others affected by the Bill.

PIONEER VOTERS

Two pioneers of the Suffrage cause in America, whose names are known all over the world, have been enfranchised by the sweeping victory of last November in New York State. They are Dr. Anna Shaw and Mrs. Chapman Catt, both of whom have paid more than one visit to England, the latter as President of the International Woman Suffrage Alliance, when it held its Congress in London. So many great women leaders in America died before victory was in sight—women like Susan B. Anthony, Frances E. Willard, and Mrs. Cady Stanton, to mention only three—that it is gratifying to know that two at least of those who have worked all their lives for women's freedom should enjoy personally the fruits of the victory which has planted the Suffrage flag in the first of the Eastern States of America.

THE "W.A.A.C.'S."

Some interesting facts have come to light with regard to women's physical fitness, in the course of the medical examination of recruits for the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps. The greater proportion of rejections are said to be due, as in the case of men, to defective teeth. On the whole, the physical standard attained by the earlier recruits was very high indeed; but, naturally, it has not been maintained at that height. One point that struck the London examiners very much was the large number of girls from City offices who devoted their spare time to outdoor exercise and sports, and so kept themselves splendidly fit.

BUSINESS, Etc.

TAILOR-MADE COSTUMES.—Latest styles to measure; best workmanship and smart cut guaranteed; from £4 4s.—H. Nelissen, 62, Great Portland-st., W. (late 14, Great Titchfield-st.).

LADIES' HANDKERCHIEF BARGAINS, hemstitched Irish Linen, slightly imperfect, bundle of six, 2s. 4d., postage 2½d.; twelve, 4s. 6d., postage 4d. Send for monthly Bargain List to-day, free.—HUTTON'S, 167, Larne, Ireland.

ELECTROLYSIS, Etc.

ANTISEPTIC ELECTROLYSIS scientifically and effectually performed. It is the only *permanent* cure for Superfluous Hair. Highest medical references. Special terms to those engaged in teaching, clerical work, &c. Consultation free. Miss Marion Lindsay, 12a, London Street, Norfolk Square, W. Telephone: 3307 Paddington.

PROFESSIONAL.

"MORE MONEY TO SPEND" (Income Tax Recovery and Adjustment). Send postcard for this booklet to Mrs. Ayres Purdie, Women Taxpayers' Agency, Hampden House, 3, Kingsway. 'Phone, Central 6049.

ISLINGTON DENTAL SURGERY,

69, Upper Street, London, N.

MR. CHODWICK BROWN, Dental Surgeon

Mr. FREDK. G. BOUCHER, Assist. Dental Surgeon

Established 35 years.

Gas Administered daily, at 11 and 3, by a Qualified Medical Man. FEE 7s. 6d.

A record of 30,000 successful cases. Nurse in attendance. Mechanical work in all its branches.

The Best Artificial Teeth from 5s.

Send Postcard for Pamphlet.

Telephone: North 3795.

No Show-case at door.

EDUCATIONAL

ADA MOORE.—Lessons in Singing, Voice Production, Diction. Visits Brighton, Winchester, weekly; West End Studio.—153, Elm Park Mansions, Park Walk, London, S.W.

MRS. MARY LAYTON, F.R.C.O. Voice Culture for Singers and Speakers. Private Lessons in Singing. Singing Classes and Ladies' Choir.—"The Châlet," 2, Fulham Park Road, S.W.

JEWELLERY.

WHY KEEP USELESS JEWELLERY? The large London market enables Robinson Brothers, of 5, Hampstead Road, London, W., and 127, Fenchurch Street, E.C., to give the best prices for Gold, Silver, Platinum, Diamonds, Pearls, Emeralds, Silver Plate, Antiques, Old Teeth, &c., in any form, condition, or quantity. Licensed valuers and appraisers. Telephone 2036 Museum. All parcels, offer or cash by return of post.

Eat less Bread

THE

WOMEN'S FREEDOM LEAGUE

WILL HOLD

PUBLIC MEETINGS

ON

WEDNESDAY AFTERNOONS,

at 3 o'clock,

Commencing January 16th, 1918.

IN THE

Minerva Café, 144, High Holborn

(Corner of Bury St., entrance in Silver St.).

For Speakers, &c., see "The Vote," 1d weekly.

Estimates for all kinds of Printing are solicited by the proprietors of "The Vote,"

144, HIGH HOLBORN, W.C. 2.

DAINTIEST DYES IN THE WORLD

Daintiest in Colour. Daintiest to Use.

MAYPOLE (Soap) DYES

Colours 6d., Black 9d.

Send for the Free Booklet, "The Perfection of Home Dyeing."

MAYPOLE CO. (1899), LTD.

17, Cumming St., LONDON, N.

BEAUTIFUL FURS!!

Wife of a commercial traveller is willing to Sell Privately some really lovely Furs (samples). Quite new. Very cheap. Includes several rich designs and valuable models. Limited number only. Accept almost any price. First applicants get the best.—Write confidentially to Mrs. H., "Arlac," Cowper Road, Rainham, Essex.

VOTES FOR WOMEN & A GOOD LAUNDRY

Good Work and Good Wages.

THE BEACONSFIELD LAUNDRY.

19, BEETHOVEN ST., KILBURN

HIGH CLASS WORK ONLY.

SEND a POST CARD for PRICE LIST

Tel: 1832 WILLESDEN.

BOOKS

For New Year's Presents

On Sale at the United Suffragists' Offices,

27, Chancery Lane, London, W.C. 2.

"A COMMUNION OF SINNERS." By EVELYN SHARP. Price **1/6** net. Post free 1/8.

The Manchester Guardian says:—"There are touches of wit or of dialect that have the effect of wit; there are ethical feeling and deftness of pen, and a view of human nature which, although sympathetic, is never sloppily sentimental . . . The book may be read almost at a sitting; but there is hardly one of the papers but repays perusal."

"THE FRANCHISE BILL: Its Progress through Parliament." Price **3d.**, post free.

(Post free 2d. for six or more copies). Now brought up to date by an addendum: gives a concise account of the Bill as it left the House of Commons. Issued by the National Council for Adult Suffrage.

"WOMEN AND THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND." By MAUDE ROYDEN. Price **3d.** Post free 3½d.

"MOTHERS IN MEAN STREETS." By ANNA MARTIN. Price **2d.** Post free 2½d.

"REBEL WOMEN." By EVELYN SHARP. Price **1/-**. Post free 1/2.

Write, enclosing Postal Order, to the Hon. Secretary, UNITED SUFFRAGISTS', at the above address.

Printed by Walbrook & Co., Ltd., 14 and 15, Whitefriars Street, London, E.C., for the Proprietors of VOTES FOR WOMEN, and Published by them at 27, Chancery Lane, W.C.